

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Little Snake Field Office
455 Emerson Street
Craig, CO 81625

DOCUMENTATION OF LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE AND NEPA ADEQUACY

NUMBER: DOI-BLM-CO-N010-2010-0023-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: COC073831

PROJECT NAME: Amendment to Hal Stewart #6 Pipeline Right-of-Way

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: S1/2NE1/4, sec. 32, T.12N., R.97W., 6th PM, Moffat County, CO

APPLICANT: Questar Gas Management Company

A. Describe the Proposed Action

Questar Gas Management Company (QGM) applied for an amendment to an existing natural gas pipeline Right-of-Way (ROW) grant to service the Hal Stewart Well #6. The application requests an extension of the existing ROW from 346 feet to 1076 feet in order to tie into an existing QGM gas pipeline in the Powderwash O&G Field. The pipeline extension would correct an error QGM made in their original ROW application. The pipeline route would follow a route offset 15 feet to the west of the Skull Creek pipeline (COC50002) and west of Moffat County Road 62. The construction period would last approximately one week. The construction workforce is expected to number 20 at the peak of construction. All construction and vehicular traffic would be confined to the ROW corridor and existing road. No new road construction is required. All disturbed areas would be reshaped to original contour and reclaimed after pipeline installation. The additional surface disturbance associated with the ROW amendment would be approximately 0.5 acre, the total ROW disturbance authorized under COC073831 would now be approximately 0.75 acre. The pipeline ROW width would be 30 feet for the entire length.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: Little Snake Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision (ROD)

Date Approved: April 26, 1989

- Draft RMP/EIS February 1986
- Final RMP/EIS September 1986
- Colorado Oil and Gas Leasing and Development Final EIS January 1991

C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

- Environmental Assessment (EA) Record, Little Snake Field Office, CO-100-2008-104 EA (April 9, 2009)

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current proposed action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document? Yes, the proposed action is basically the same action that has been previously analyzed in EA CO-100-2008-104. This proposed action consists of a buried gas pipeline to service the Hal Stewart Well #6; this action was considered and analyzed in EA CO-100-2008-104. In this proposed action the length of the pipeline is amended in order to tie into an existing gas pipeline within the Powder Wash Field, the area analyzed in EA CO-100-2008-104.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values? Yes, the range of alternative is appropriate given the limited scope of this proposal. The area where the proposed action is located is within a developed oil & gas field, the Powder Wash Field. No new road construction will occur. The buried gas pipeline would be located adjacent to an existing oil & gas field road and tie into an existing gas pipeline.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances? Yes, the existing analysis is still valid. The length of the ROW has changed due to insufficient length to tie into the existing pipeline. The gas pipeline length would increase an additional 730 feet. The surface disturbance would be increased by approximately 0.50 acres.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action? Yes, the methodology and analytical approach is still valid. The ROW length changed to accommodate a QGM request to correct an error in the original ROW proposal.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action? Yes, the direct and indirect impacts of this proposed action are substantially unchanged from those identified in EA CO-100-2008-104. Gas pipeline installation for the Hal Stewart Well #6 was analyzed; all that has changed is to amend the ROW length by 730 feet.

6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Yes, the cumulative impacts that would result from the installation of the

additional 730 feet of gas pipeline are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in EA CO-100-2008-104. The potential exists for future oil and gas development throughout the Powder Wash Field. Currently numerous producing wells exist within a one-mile radius of the proposed gas pipeline.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action? Yes, the public involvement and interagency review associated with EA CO-100-2008-104 EA is adequate for this proposed action.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet.

Name	Title	Resource Represented	Initials/Date
Barb Blackstun	Realty Specialist	Air Quality, Floodplains, Prime/Unique Farmlands, Surface Water Quality	BSB 11/17/09
Robyn Morris	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources, Native American Concerns	RWM 12/02/09
Barb Blackstun	Realty Specialist	Environmental Justice	BSB 11/17/09
Hunter Seim	Rangeland Management Specialist	Invasive Non-native Species	JHS 11/20/09
Hunter Seim	Rangeland Management Specialist	Sensitive Plants, T&E Plant	JHS 11/20/09
Tim Novotny	Wildlife Biologist	T&E Animal	TMN 11/14/09
Marty O'Mara	Petroleum Geologist	Ground Water Quality	EMO 11/17/09
Tim Novotny	Wildlife Biologist	Wetlands/Riparian Zones	TMN 11/14/09
Kimberly Miller	Outdoor Recreation Specialist	WSA, W&S Rivers	KMM 11/16/09

STANDARDS:

Name	Title	Standard	Initials/Date
Tim Novotny	Wildlife Biologist	Animal Communities	TMN 11/14/09
Tim Novotny	Wildlife Biologist	Special Status, T&E Animal	TMN 11/14/09
Hunter Seim	Rangeland Management Specialist	Plant Communities	JHS 11/20/09
Hunter Seim	Rangeland Management Specialist	Special Status, T&E Plant	JHS 11/20/09
Tim Novotny	Wildlife Biologist	Riparian Systems	TMN 11/14/09
Barb Blackstun	Realty Specialist	Water Quality	BSB 11/17/09
Barb Blackstun	Realty Specialist	Upland Soils	BSB 11/17/09

Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Signature of Lead Specialist_____ Date_____

Signature of NEPA Coordinator_____ Date_____

Signature of the Authorizing Official_____ Date_____

Note: The signed Conclusion on this document is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision.